

## Remarks

### Status

Claims 1-20, 22-25 and 27, 28 and 31-33 were pending in the application. Claims 7 and 31-33 have been canceled by this amendment, leaving claims 1-6, 8-20, 22-25, 27 and 28 pending in the case, a total of 25 claims, of which 3 are independent claims (1, 15 and 23).

### Rejections

Claims 1-14 and 31-33 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 31-33 have been canceled by this amendment and the language upon which the rejection was based has been removed from claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that this rejection has been overcome and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuBois (US 6,793,460) and Sawyer (US 6,762,929). Claim 7 has been canceled by this amendment.

DuBois teaches a fan-shaped sign with a cross-bar holding arm, Figures 4, 5 and 7 that may include a word printed on the surface of the fan illuminated by LEDs, col. 4, lines 1-2. DuBois does not teach *at least one display section having addressable elements to form an image...* The office action stipulates this on pages 5 and 6.

Sawyer is directed to a display panel that extensible to form a display for a computer, col. 3, lines 21-29. Sawyer does not provide any details as to the nature of the display other than that they may be polymer light emitting diodes.

As amended claim 1 requires that the display have addressable elements to form an image *and display layer components to activate and deactivate an addressed display element.* The combination of DuBois and Sawyer does not teach that a collapsible display have addressable

elements and the display layer components, much less one that also has at least three collapsible sections.

It is therefore submitted that claims 1-6 and 8-14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 15-19 and 23 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gomez in view of Chang et al.

Gomez discloses a gardeners hat upon which a raised or relief ‘display’ may be made, where the display is printed on the drape of the hat, col. 7, lines 19-32. This is not a display having addressable elements as previously claimed in 15 and 23. Further, it does not appear that Gomez teaches a *smaller visible area*, as the drape ‘display’ is designed to be retracted or folded up so as to be out of sight, col. 7, lines 33-47.

Chang is directed to a flexible device that has a ‘grammar’ associated with it. There is no indication in Chang that the display consists of addressable display elements. The text referenced in the office action merely refers to the display as being able to display text or icons of documents. Further, the twisting motion discussed relative to Figure 10 does not teach that there is a smaller visible area, as the twisting motion merely indicates a ‘reset’ operation in the motion grammar disclosed in Chang, col. 10, lines 11-17.

As amended claims 15 and 23 require *a flexible display membrane having addressable display elements and display layer components for activating and deactivating addressed display elements*. For the reasons set out above, this is not shown taught or suggested by this combination of references.

Further, as amended claim 15 requires that the display *form the expanded configuration with a single action*. In Gomez, using ties or the twisting motions disclosed requires multiple

actions. Similarly, the twisting motion in Chang requires several actions by both hands, rather than a single action. The support for this amendment can be found in the specification in several places, among them paragraph 0044.

It is therefore submitted that claims 15-19 and 23 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 24, 25, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gomez in view of Chang as applied to claim 23 and further in view of Dubois.

These claims depend from claim 23 and as such, inherently include all of the requirements of claim 23. As discussed above, the combination of Gomez in view of Chang does not teach all of the elements of claim 23, much less the further features of these claims. DuBois does not cure this deficiency.

It is therefore submitted that claims 24, 25, 27 and 28 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gomez in view of Sawyer and further in view of Comiskey et al. (US 6,473,072).

Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and inherently includes all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claim. The addition of Comiskey does not cure these deficiencies. It is therefore submitted that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 20 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gomez in view of Chang as applied to claim 15 and further in view of DuBois.

Claim 20 depends from claim 15 and inherently includes all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claim. DuBois does not cure this deficiency. It is therefore submitted that claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 31 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuBois and Sawyer as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Chang. Claims 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Sawyer.

Claims 31-33 have been canceled by this amendment.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all pending claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

**Customer No. 65650**

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

*Julie L. Reed*

---

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

210 SW Morrison Street  
Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97204  
503-222-3613